



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/659,171

09/09/2003

Bruce Bokish

7000-287

3747

27820

7590

06/23/2006

WITHROW & TERRANOVA, P.L.L.C.

P.O. BOX 1287

CARY, NC 27512

EXAMINER

SMITH, CREIGHTON H

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2614

DATE MAILED: 06/23/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Application No. 10/659,171	Applicant(s) BOKISH, BRUCE	
	Examiner Creighton H. Smith	Art Unit 2614	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 26 MAY '06 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
 (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
 (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
 5. ☒ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): the 112 problems noted in the final office action.
 6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
 7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
 The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
 Claim(s) allowed: none.
 Claim(s) objected to: 7 and 24.
 Claim(s) rejected: 1,2,4,6,8,14,16-19,21,23,25,29,31,33 and 34.
 Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
 9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☐ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
 12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
 13. ☐ Other: _____.



Creighton H Smith
 Primary Examiner
 Art Unit: 2614

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that the difference between their invention and Sakata's is that Sakata's "REQUEST" is just for a pointer, i.e., a URL address, which URL address is stored on Sakata's phone. In contrast, applicant argues that the "actual information" requested is transmitted back to a user's phone, not just a URL address as Sakata is doing. Applicant never positively claims that the actual information requested is sent back to the user's phone along with a pointer. This language, contrary to applicant's argument, is not present in the claim. The difference between Sakata's and applicant's apparatuses is precisely what applicant is arguing. i.e., that the actual information along with a pointer (URL address) is being sent back to applicant's phone. But, the "actual information along with a pointer" has not been positively claimed. In fact, in applicant's "sending" step in claim 18, it states that a pointer is sent to a phone terminal, and that pointer identifies the location where the information is located. No where in that claim, or any of the other claims, is there any claim language stating "actual information associated with a pointer."

Applicant's remarks re the 35 U.S.C. 112 objection have been overcome. However, applicant's remarks re "the first network" do not distinguish over Sakata, because the "REQUEST" from portable terminal (20) to RFID device (30) and the "POINTER" back to the portable terminal are deemed both over the same network in view of the fact that Sakata makes no disclosure of the "REQUEST" being over a different network from that of the "POINTER." Sakata's Figure 1 and applicant's Figure 1 both indicate that the information is being transmitted over only one network. Neither Sakata nor applicant specifically disclose over a 1st network. However, it is inherent that looking at both Sakata and applicant's figure 1, this is what is transpiring

Concerning applicant's remarks re claims 2 & 19, Newton's Telecom Dictionary defines a call as "two people or two machines are on a phone line speaking to each other." Therefore, Sakata's "REQUEST" for info is a call..